

ERIC Document Resume		See Instruction Sheet		DATE OF RESUME 8/11/65	DATE RECEIVED
A. PUBLICATION DATA					
ERIC NUMBER ED000449		2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7201		3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.	
4. AUTHOR(S): N.A.				DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW	
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The California Public Junior College System: The Current Situation and Future Needs				MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE YES ☒ NO ☐	
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.				COPYRIGHT GRANTED YES ☐ NO ☒	
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.				COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED YES ☐ NO ☐	
8. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE California State Department of Education				TYPE OF REPORT PROPOSAL ☐ IN-PROGRESS ☐ FINAL ☒ FOLLOW-UP ☐	
9. PLACE OF ORIGIN ORG. Calif. State Dept. of Education ST. Education CITY Sacramento, Calif. STATE TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE				OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:	
10. VOL. N.A.	11. PAGES N.A.	12. MO./YR. 1/ 60	13. TOTAL PP. 20	ERIC SATELLITE CODE	
3. INDEXING DATA					
4. SUBJECT AREA			15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR survey		
6. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)					
surveys		development			
junior colleges		planning		demographic factors	
public schools		needs		finances	

7. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Identifies problems of future growth and development in California junior colleges. Covers number and average daily attendance; districts authorized to maintain colleges; county junior college tax rates in non-junior-college territory; county activities for formation of junior college districts up to January 15, 1960; and summary of suggested outcomes from counties where survey for junior college organization has been made, activity is current, and need is evident.

IC No.	18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT		
	C. FUNDING DATA		
	19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. PROJECT NO.
		22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
			23. DURATION OR PROJECT

IV - 20
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE SYSTEM:

The Current Situation and Future Needs

By the

Bureau of Junior College Education
Hugh G. Price, Chief

and the

Bureau of School District Organization
Drayton B. Nuttall, Chief

January 20, 1960

California State Department of Education
Sacramento 14, California

Roy E. Simpson
Superintendent of Public Instruction
and Director of Education

Jay Davis Conner
Associate Superintendent of
Public Instruction and
Chief, Division of Instruction

Wallace W. Hall
Associate Superintendent of Public
Instruction and Chief, Division
of Public School Administration

ED 000449

THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE SYSTEM:
The Current Situation and Future Needs

It is the intent of this report on "The California Public Junior College System" to identify the problems of future growth and development of these two-year institutions within the state. A number of critical issues are involved in the long-term planning of junior colleges and these include not only the steady increase in the number of high school graduates and their ambitions for further education, but also the number of new campuses planned for the University of California and the state college system, and also the admission standards which are to be established at these campuses. The analysis of these issues by the Master Plan Survey Committee with its resulting recommendations will have a great impact on future growth and development of junior colleges.

It must be pointed out at once that the formation of districts for the purpose of maintaining junior colleges, after approval of a proposed plan has been given by the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education, is entirely in the hands of the local people, the same as the formation of all other school districts. The law clearly sets forth the provisions for establishing junior college districts, and there is no way that the State Department of Education or the Legislature, except by legislative enactment, could force the establishment of junior college districts unless they are desired by the people themselves.

This report in part has been prepared to point out that local initiative rather than state directive is responsible for the organization of new and the enlargement of old districts maintaining junior colleges. Any attempt to establish a "priority list" is of little value except to identify areas of need for junior college services. The determination of local citizens and their initiative are the key to the establishment of junior college services.

Such factors as local present and projected need in terms of the numbers of youth to be served, the present and projected assessed wealth of real property, the present and projected local tax rates, other local higher educational services, the educational ambitions held by citizens for their children, the economic status of an area and its tax burden for other schools, the geographic terrain, and the transportation facilities, are all related to the desire and willingness of citizens to request junior college district organization in any area. While the State Department of Education stands ready to assist in the organization of a new district through consultant and survey services, the initiative must come from the people of the area.

While the law requires that high school boards shall submit resolutions to the State Board of Education requesting an election, before such an election is held a survey of the situation must be made by the Department before the Board of Education acts on the matter. To prevent the presentation of resolutions for unrealistic or unapprovable districts, the Bureau of School District Organization has been preparing surveys at the request of local boards in advance of their resolutions. Many such surveys have been made both by the Bureau and by county committees on school district reorganization, which will be reported in the following study. While several surveys which recommend district formation have been made but not yet implemented by local areas, they nevertheless form the basis for later activity.

This study is submitted instead of a priority report. Much of the material in it is taken from a report with the same title prepared as of March

15, 1957, as a report to a legislative committee, by the State Department of Education, except that it has been brought up to date and modified in terms of new information.

There is an expressed objective of the State Department of Education to include every high school district of the state in a junior college district. While this objective is very slowly being realized, there is evidence that real progress is being made. On the other hand, in sparsely settled areas there is little reason to believe that the organization of new junior colleges or enlargement of existing districts will of necessity be to the advantage of the citizens of these areas immediately. That the residents of these areas assume some responsibility for the financing of junior college districts which serve their youth is, however, an accepted principle.

I. TYPE AND FORMATION

There are three types of districts authorized to maintain junior colleges. The following paragraphs describe each type of district and tell how it is formed:

A. Junior College Districts. These are separate political subdivisions of the state. The sole responsibility of the governing boards is the educational program for grades 13 and 14. A junior college district may be formed by two methods:

First, the governing board of one or more high school districts may petition the State Board of Education for permission to call an election for the purpose of forming a junior college district composed of the petitioning districts.

Second, a county committee on school district organization may make a recommendation for an election which, when approved by the State Board of Education, shall be called.

There are at the present time 28 separate junior college districts.*

B. High School Districts. High school districts at one time were authorized to establish and maintain junior colleges. The authority for high school districts to establish junior colleges has been revoked, but the existing junior colleges in high school districts were continued in operation. There are 16 districts of this type.

C. Unified School Districts. The governing board of any unified school district having an assessed valuation of \$100,000,000 and an average daily attendance of 3,500 or more in grades 9-12 may establish a junior college on its own motion. The governing board is responsible for the educational program from kindergarten to grade 14. There are 12 districts of this type in the state.

II. EXISTING JUNIOR COLLEGES

A. Number and Average Daily Attendance. At the present time there are 56 districts authorized to maintain junior colleges in the state.* Tables 1, 2, and 3 show the districts by type, the number of present and projected campuses by 1975, the high school and junior college average daily attendance within the districts, and the assessed valuation of the districts.

*This does not include districts in process of organization in Barstow, Victor Valley, and Imperial County.

TABLE 1

Existing Junior College Districts; Number of Colleges; Number of High School and Unified Districts; Average Daily Attendance in Grades 9-12 and 13-14; and Assessed Valuation

Junior College District	County	Number of Colleges		Number of High School and Unified Districts	1958-59 A.D.A.		1958-59 Assessed Valuation
		Present	Expected by 1975		Grades 9-12	Grades 13-14	
American River	Sacramento	1	2	2	10,784	1,337	\$ 170,633,850
Cabrillo	Santa Cruz	1	1	3	3,863	—	135,652,843
Cerritos	Los Angeles	1	1	2	8,218	624	180,305,870
Chaffey	San Bernardino	1	1	2	7,008	1,864	220,829,640
Coachella Valley	Riverside	1	1	2	2,349	—	164,656,005
Compton	Los Angeles	1	1	3	10,165	2,533	229,563,660
Contra Costa	Contra Costa	2	4	5	22,792	3,243	742,965,545
El Camino	Los Angeles	1	1	5	19,367	4,405	755,746,830
Foothill	Santa Clara	1	2	3	9,670	537	337,768,950
Fullerton	Orange	1	1	1	5,307	3,207	181,868,500
Hartnell	Monterey	1	1	3	3,853	1,228	209,031,830
Los Angeles	Los Angeles	7	11	3	124,040	25,302	5,539,904,200
Marin	Marin	1	1	2	4,799	875	178,689,755
Modesto	Stanislaus	1	1	1	4,609	2,805	103,713,140
Mt. San Antonio	Los Angeles	1	1	4	13,131	3,021	363,746,010
Northern San Diego Co.	San Diego	1	1	3	3,191	579	98,753,500
Orange Coast	Orange	1	1	2	4,868	2,352	266,672,550
Pasadena	Los Angeles	1	1	2	9,399	7,136	287,557,610
Riverside	Riverside	1	1	1	6,902	1,798	172,091,840
San Bernardino Valley	San Bernardino	1	2	3	10,251	2,543	243,638,460
San Mateo	San Mateo	1	4	3	9,914	3,002	344,491,699
Santa Ana	Orange	1	1	1	3,354	1,241	122,162,920
Santa Maria	Santa Barbara	1	1	1	1,750	332	121,357,150
Santa Rosa	Sonoma	1	1	2	5,989	1,785	118,801,190
Sequoias	Tulare	1	1	5	5,822	1,765	157,400,615
Sierra	Placer	1	1	4	3,401	748	109,125,560
Siskiyou	Siskiyou	1	1	2	1,736	6	49,286,100
Yuba County	Yuba	1	1	2	1,473	1,131	50,044,155
Totals		35	47	76	316,005	75,409	\$11,756,459,977
Totals for the State		63	76	332	648,700	128,822	\$18,328,979,758
Per Cent of State Totals		55.6	61.9	22.9	48.7	58.5	64.1

TABLE 2

High School Districts Maintaining Junior Colleges;
Number of Colleges; Average Daily Attendance in
Grades 9-12 and 13-14; and Assessed Valuation

High School District	County	Number of Colleges		1958-59 A.D.A.		1958-59 Assessed Valuation
		Present	Expected by 1975	Grades 9-12	Grades 13-14	
Antelope Valley Joint Union	Los Angeles	1	1	3,589	681	\$ 157,994,570
Central Union	Imperial	1	0*	1,221	271	28,832,097
Citrus Union	Los Angeles	1	1	3,247	965	82,888,160
Coalinga Union	Fresno	1	1	561	476	164,996,500
Kern County Joint Union	Kern	1	1	12,725	2,635	474,169,370
Lassen Union	Lassen	1	1	666	221	17,308,430
Monterey Union	Monterey	1	1	1,990	1,358	55,645,335
Napa Union	Napa	1	1	2,628	540	56,436,390
Oceanside-Carlsbad Union	San Diego	1	1	1,394	469	53,870,930
Porterville Union	Tulare	1	1	2,043	398	56,721,245
Reedley Joint Union	Fresno	1	1	895	1,111	24,582,020
San Benito County	San Benito	1	1	785	127	43,263,530
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara	1	1	3,321	702	146,853,700
Shasta Union	Shasta	1	1	2,522	1,188	79,043,788
Taft Union	Kern	1	1	995	406	122,203,670
Ventura Union	Ventura	1	1	2,559	1,600	209,974,350
Totals		16	15	41,141	13,148	\$ 1,774,784,085
Totals for the State		63	76	648,700	123,822	\$18,328,979,758
Per Cent of State Totals		25.4	19.7	6.3	10.2	9.7

*Becomes part of Imperial County Junior College District.

TABLE 3

Unified School Districts Maintaining Junior Colleges;
Number of Colleges; Average Daily Attendance in
Grades 9-12 and 13-14; and Assessed Valuation

Unified District	County	Number of Colleges		1958-59 A.D.A.		1958-59 Assessed Valuation
		Present	Expected by 1975	Grades 9-12	Grades 13-14	
Fresno	Fresno	1	1	9,190	2,320	\$ 227,048,920
Glendale	Los Angeles	1	1	6,228	3,059	219,910,390
Long Beach	Los Angeles	1	1	16,147	5,007	676,457,570
Oakland	Alameda	1	2	13,659	4,962	595,807,873
Palo Verde	Riverside	1	1	651	191	27,063,590
Sacramento	Sacramento	1	1	9,397	3,394	278,731,570
San Diego	San Diego	1	2	21,002	3,977	717,701,990
San Francisco	San Francisco	1	1*	25,295	5,956	1,364,906,083
San Jose	Santa Clara	1	1	5,668	2,702	235,352,440
Santa Monica	Los Angeles	1	1	3,681	5,272	225,294,250
Stockton	San Joaquin	1	1	6,460	2,229	169,065,980
Vallejo	Solano	1	1	3,053	1,196	60,395,040
Totals		12	14	120,431	40,265	\$ 4,797,735,696
Totals for the State		63	76	648,700	128,822	\$18,328,979,758
Per Cent of State Totals		19.0	18.4	18.6	31.3	26.2

*San Francisco has not responded to a request for its long-term plan for expansion.

TABLE 4

Recapitulation of Tables 1, 2, and 3

	Number of Districts Maintaining Junior Colleges	Number of Counties Included	Number of High School and Unified Districts Included	1958-59 A.D.A.	
				High School	Junior College
1. District Totals	56	31	113	477,577	128,822
2. State Totals	56	58	332	648,700	128,822
3. Per Cent of State Totals (% Line 1 is of Line 2)	100.0	53.5	34.0	73.6	100.0

III. COUNTY JUNIOR COLLEGE TAX RATES IN NON-JUNIOR COLLEGE TERRITORY

In order that all California youth may have the opportunity to profit from free public junior college education whether or not they live in a district maintaining a junior college, provision is made in the Education Code for the pro rata cost of instruction of these students in whatever junior college they enroll, to be charged back to the taxpayers of the county non-junior college area in which they reside. In addition, a fee of \$300 per unit of average daily attendance is also charged. A special county junior college tax is charged for the education of these "out-of-district" students.

Table 5, Junior College Tuition Tax Rates, which follows, shows the county tax charged during the five fiscal years from 1955-56 through 1959-60. It will be noted that each year the median tax has increased.

As county junior college tax rates increase and approach the tax rates of districts maintaining junior colleges, there is a natural pressure created on these non-junior college areas either to annex to an existing junior college district or move toward the organization of a new junior college district, whichever is most appropriate. A study of the 1959-60 tax rates identifies in part the areas where junior college activity will be found. When the tax rate exceeds twenty-five cents, taxpayers become alert to possible future developments and activity on their part results.

TABLE 5

JUNIOR COLLEGE TUITION TAX RATES, BY COUNTY - 1955-59, INCLUSIVE*

Sources: 1955-56, 1958-59 - Bureau of Junior College Education
1956-57, 1957-58 - Official Reports of County Superintendents to Bureau of School Apportionments
1959-60 - County Superintendents of Schools to Henry T. Tyler for MAPS, August-September, 1959

County	1959-60	1958-59	1957-58	1956-57	1955-56
Alameda	.2963	.2168	.1464	.141	.15
Alpine	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Amador	.093	.085	.0539	.0295	.04
Butte	.095	.102	.072	.066	.047
Calaveras	.15	.15	.06	.06	.05
Colusa	.12	.09	.08	.08	.07
Contra Costa	-	-	-	-	-
Del Norte	.069	.062	.0110	.017	.019
El Dorado	.16	.18	.13	.11	.13
Fresno	.1907	.1915	.126	.11	.101
Glenn	.025	.028	.014	.015	.039
Humboldt	.03	.028	.02	.015	.015
Imperial	.194	.154	.10	.10	.07
Inyo	.1179	.0882	.0482	.0502	.061
Kern	.15	.15	.11	.11	.07

*Table 5 has been assembled by Henry T. Tyler, Modesto Junior College.

County	1959-60	1958-59	1957-58	1956-57	1955-56
Kings	.29	.24	.17	.17	.115
Lake	.10	.13	.08	.05	.07
Lassen	.18	.19	.24	.45	.30
Los Angeles	.3821	.3426	.2324	.2352	.2537
Madera	.173	.1690	.101	.089	.075
Marin	.21	.25	.08	.12	.11
Mariposa	.139	.068	.09	.053	.01
Mendocino	.15	.17	.10	.09	.09
Merced	.20	.20	.17	.12	.08
Modoc	.0635	.0469	.0630	.035	.0424
Mono	.00	.03	.00	.00	.01
Monterey	.48	.52	.34	.26	.23
Napa	.18	.18	.14	.24	.16
Nevada	.43	.31	.1900	.15	.16
Orange	.3716	.3549	.2279	.2221	.2360
Placer	-	-	-	.21	.18
Plumas	.039	.041	.018	.045	.03
Riverside	.2180	.124	.078	.084	.0860
Sacramento	.21	.26	.17	.16	.31
San Benito	-	-	-	-	-
San Bernardino	.23	.21	.14	.13	.12
San Diego	.24	.25	.1200	NA*	.12
San Francisco	-	-	-	-	-
San Joaquin	.318	.286	.1600	.182	.172
San Luis Obispo	.11	.10	.12	.12	.08
San Mateo	.2604	.2394	.1745	.166	.167
Santa Barbara	.11	.14	.0900	.0700	.07
Santa Clara	.209	.203	.113	.105	.095
Santa Cruz	-	.34	.22	.23	.155
Shasta	.21	.21	.14	.05	.18
Sierra	.115	.084	.048	.0384	.02
Siskiyou	.08	.06	.0524	.0873	.08
Solano	.13	.10	.11	NA*	.09
Sonoma	.33	.30	.22	.18	.20
Stanislaus	.42	.26	.35	.25	.23
Sutter	.39	.38	.24	.25	.21
Tehama	.16	.175	.13	.14	.175
Trinity	.11	.09	.17	.14	.26
Tulare	.32	.32	.22	.18	.20
Tuolumne	.20	.11	.09	.07	.07
Ventura	.37	.43	.32	.27	.26
Yolo	.26	.26	.14	.14	.09
Yuba	-	-	-	-	-
Median	.1850	.1775	.1217	.1167	.0975
Number Under .10	10	14	20	22	28
Number Under .20	29	31	43	42	43
Number .30 and Over	10	9	3	1	2
Number .35 and Over	7	4	1	1	0

*NA - Not Available

IV. ACTIVITIES IN CALIFORNIA COUNTIES REGARDING THE FORMATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS UP TO JANUARY 15, 1960

The following county-by-county outline is a statement of current activity regarding the establishment or expansion of California junior college districts with comments where necessary to explain the developments of new districts or the enlargement of existing ones.

Alameda County: Four surveys have been made of non-junior college territory in Alameda County:

1. Involving Alameda City.
2. Involving Southern Alameda County.
3. Involving Berkeley.
4. Involving San Leandro Unified School District, Hayward Union High School District, and Washington Union High School District.

At the time the Alameda City survey was made, it was concluded that a junior college in this district was not as feasible as would be the case if Alameda were to join with San Leandro, Hayward, and perhaps other areas in the establishment of a district involving a broader territory.

Subsequent boundary changes annexing territory to the City of Oakland have, however, isolated the Alameda City district so that it is no longer contiguous to San Leandro. Such a circumstance would probably require restudy of the Alameda City situation. A more recent opinion has been made which reports the establishment of contiguity so that Alameda City may once again be able to join with its neighbors to the south.

An earlier survey involving Southern Alameda County gives tentative approval to the establishment of a junior college district consisting of all of the territory generally situated south and east of Oakland including Alameda City Unified, San Leandro Unified, Hayward Union High School, Washington Union High School, Amador Valley Joint Union High School, and Livermore Joint Union High School Districts. No action on this survey or recommendation has been taken.

A study of the Berkeley area indicated that the Berkeley Unified School District is sufficiently large that a junior college within this district could be established by action of the district board. Two years ago the board took this action and within months rescinded the action. The need for a junior college still exists, and a junior college district including Emeryville and Albany would be appropriate. This would require school board resolution, State Board approval, and the vote of citizens in the three districts.

A more recent survey in this county has studied the possibility of:

1. A junior college within the San Leandro Unified School District.
2. A junior college district consisting of the Hayward Union High School District.
3. The possible combination of the San Leandro Unified School District and the Hayward Union High School District.

4. The combination of San Leandro Unified School District and the Hayward and Washington Union High School Districts.

The survey indicated clear preference for either the third or fourth of these area combinations. Citizens committees are actively studying possible junior college developments in both areas. The restriction of the new Alameda County State College to the upper division and graduate programs until an adequate junior college has been established is another reason why junior college activity has increased.

Oakland City College of the Oakland Unified School District presently provides the only junior college services in this populous county, and critical need exists for relief from heavy out-of-district enrollments.

Alpine County: No prospects for a junior college district affiliation or indication of need.

Amador County: There have been no surveys or recommendations made although there have been some preliminary discussions between people in Amador, Calaveras, and Tuolumne Counties of a possible three-county junior college district. No formal action of any kind has been taken to request a survey of this area.

Butte County: There has been no survey made involving Butte County, and no formal action of any kind is pending. Previous considerations have indicated the possible establishment of a Butte-Glenn-Tehama County district. Action in this area is unlikely until decisions are reached affecting the junior college functions now being carried out at Chico State College; and even then there is evidence that Corning Union High School District, Red Bluff Union High School District, and Orland Joint Union High School District are satisfied with present services provided by Shasta College at Redding, and that Oroville Union High School District, Biggs Union High School District, and Gridley Union High School District are satisfied with services from Yuba College at Marysville. Chico City High School District, Paradise Unified School District, and Glenn County Joint Union High School District cannot be said to have adequate junior college services at the present time.

Calaveras County: (See Amador.)

Colusa County: No surveys have been made involving Colusa County territory. There appear to be four possibilities with respect to Colusa County:

1. Possible grouping together with Sutter and Yuba Counties.
2. Possible inclusion within the Butte, Glenn, and Tehama County area.
3. Possible combination of Yolo and Colusa Counties with perhaps northern Solano County.
4. Possible division to incorporate combinations of the above.

Contra Costa County: The county is now organized as the Contra Costa Junior College District, which has long-term plans for adding two more colleges to the two already maintained.

Del Norte County: There are no prospects of any action in Del Norte County. This area should probably be included with any consideration in Humboldt County. Activity in this area will probably rest on decisions relating to the role to be played by Humboldt State College. Recommendations by the Master Plan Survey Committee that junior college services be discontinued at Humboldt State College may well result in the establishment of need for a junior college at Eureka to serve neighboring areas.

El Dorado County: There are no prospects of any immediate activity in this county. It appears that this area should either be included in the Sierra Junior College District (see Placer County) or join a junior college district in Sacramento County.

Fresno County: A survey has been made involving the Reedley Joint Union High School District which now operates a junior college and the immediately contiguous territory. At the time of this survey the establishment of such a district was not economically feasible. The 1959 changes in the method of apportioning funds for junior college purposes may change this condition. It appears that a complete broad study of junior college services is needed in the Fresno County area. Both of the existing colleges in this county draw extensively from graduates of surrounding high school districts which are not part of the districts operating the junior colleges. Fresno City College, along with Reedley and Coalinga College, serves this out-of-district area.

Glenn County: (See Butte.)

Humboldt County: (See Del Norte.)

Imperial County: The State Board of Education in July, 1959, approved the recommendation of the Imperial County Committee on School District Organization for the conducting of an election to establish a junior college district to include the territory of all the high school and unified school districts in Imperial County. The election resulted in the citizens' approval of such a district, and it is in the process of development. It will result in the closing out of the present Imperial Valley College maintained by the Central Union High School District at El Centro.

Inyo County: The Inyo County territory was included in the survey made of the Eastern Kern County area. (See Kern County.)

Kern County: A survey was made of the eastern Kern County area including Muroc Unified School District, Mojave Unified School District, and Tehachapi Unified School District; Randsburg-Johannesburg portion of the Antelope Valley Joint Union High School District; China Lake-Indian Wells portion of the Kern County Joint Union High School District; Trona Unified School District of San Bernardino County, and the Inyo County area.

Any possible establishment of junior college facilities in eastern Kern County would involve the inclusion of the China Lake-Indian Wells Valley area. This survey indicated the possible feasibility of a junior college district in this general area. However, its accomplishment involved some other changes in school district organization, and it does not appear likely that any action will be taken in this area in the immediate future.

The County Committee on School District Organization has been considering the general county problem of junior college services as a result of which a survey has been made at the request of the Kern County Joint Union High School

District board to consider the establishment of a separate junior college district to maintain Bakersfield College, which, to begin with, will comprise the territory of this one high school district. Later it might expect the annexation of several adjacent high school districts.

Taft College, maintained by the Taft Union High School District, also serves Kern County.

Kings County: There has been no activity involving Kings County except that informal conversations have been held between representatives of Coalinga College and residents of adjoining high school districts in Kings County.

Lake County: A survey was made of the Lake and Mendocino County area which indicated the desirability of establishing a junior college district involving these two counties. No formal action of any kind has been taken since the survey was made, but action is anticipated as the result of interest now being displayed by laymen and professional educators in these two counties.

Lassen County: A junior college in Lassen County is now operated by the Lassen Union High School District. There is no activity in this area relating to the establishment of a junior college district.

Los Angeles County: Several surveys have been made in the Los Angeles County area, which is presently served by the seven colleges of the Los Angeles City Junior College District and ten colleges in the county outside of the city:

1. A survey of the Alhambra City and El Monte Union High School District areas indicated that a junior college district involving these two high school districts would be feasible.
2. A subsequent survey involving the Alhambra City, El Monte Union, and Whittier Union High School Districts and the Montebello Unified School District, dealt with three possible area combinations, any of which appeared to be feasible as far as operating junior college services was involved. These included:
 - a. The area including all four districts.
 - b. The Whittier Union High School District alone.
 - c. The combination of Alhambra, El Monte, and Montebello.

While many of the young people who live in these areas are attending adjacent junior colleges, there is substantial need for one or more junior colleges to serve the large number of potential students in this present out-of-district area.

3. A study of the Burbank area indicated that this unified district had sufficient students and assessed valuation to establish its own junior college, or that the Burbank Unified School District could join the Los Angeles City Junior College District, or that a possible junior college district might be established including the Burbank and Glendale Unified School Districts. The Burbank board has made no decision as to the direction it will take in solving its problem.

4. A survey of the Citrus and Monrovia-Duarte Union High School Districts, together with the Arcadia Unified School District, indicated that a feasible junior college district could be established including all three districts, or including the Citrus and Monrovia-Duarte Union High School Districts.

No formal action has been taken of any kind by any of the governing boards in any of these areas. The problems in these areas, however, are sufficiently acute that some decisions will need to be made in the near future. The interest of the Los Angeles City Junior College District in adding Montebello to its district has been informally expressed.

Madera County: At present some people in Madera County are interested and are participating with the Merced County Committee on School District Organization considering the possible formation of a Merced-Madera district. There is some question as to whether the Madera area should look to Merced or toward Fresno for the solution of its junior college problems.

Marin County: There is no action in Marin County either to establish a new district or to expand the existing Marin Junior College District.

Mariposa County: There is no activity in this county, nor is any expected in the near future.

Mendocino County: (See Lake.)

Merced County: A survey has been made indicating the desirability of establishing a junior college district in the Merced area. Such a district is currently under study by the Merced County Committee on School District Organization with Madera County people participating in the discussions.

Modoc County: There is no activity in this county, nor any substantial need.

Mono County: There is no activity in this county, nor any substantial need.

Monterey County: Surveys have been made indicating the feasibility and desirability of establishing a junior college district consisting of the Monterey Union High School District and the Carmel and Pacific Grove Unified School Districts. The State Board of Education has approved an election in the Monterey Union High School District for a coterminous junior college district which would operate the existing Monterey Peninsula College. If this election is successful, the boards at Carmel and Pacific Grove have indicated their intent to hold annexation elections.

Along with the above proposal, there has been some interest in the possibility of an eventual county junior college district which would include Hartnell College at Salinas.

Napa County: There is no activity in this county which indicates any change in the junior college situation. At present the junior college in this county is operated by the Napa Union High School District.

Nevada County: There is expressed interest in this county to join the Sierra Junior College District.

Orange County: There is under way at present a countywide study of junior college facilities in this county. The study is being made by the County Committee on School District Organization in cooperation with the governing boards of the junior college and high school districts of the county. There is evidence of need for expanded services. Junior colleges presently operating are Orange Coast College at Costa Mesa, Santa Ana College at Santa Ana, and Fullerton Junior College at Fullerton.

Placer County: This county is entirely included within the existing Sierra Junior College District, which is at present constructing a new campus on the new Route 40 at Rocklin. Extension of the area of this district to include part or all of Nevada and El Dorado Counties has been suggested.

Plumas County: There is no activity in this county, nor any substantial need.

Riverside County: There is no current activity in this county although indications point to the necessity of study regarding expansion of the district which maintains Riverside City College. The new Coachella Valley Junior College District is preparing to build its campus between Palm Springs and Indio. Palo Verde College is a small institution serving the area around Blythe.

Sacramento County: The Sacramento County Committee on School District Organization has under way a study of junior college services including the whole county along with portions of Yolo and San Joaquin Counties. It has been requested that the Committee include the Sacramento Unified School District as well as the American River Junior College District in such a study. The possible inclusion of El Dorado County has been suggested. (See Sutter County.)

San Benito County: The small unaccredited county junior college here is operated by the high school district.

San Bernardino County: As the result of an election, the Barstow Union High School District area has established a junior college district. A petition to establish a junior college district in the Victor Valley Union High School District area has been approved by the State Board of Education, and the election will take place soon. San Bernardino Valley College presently serves both of these out-of-district areas, as well as its own district. Evidence of need for another campus in this district is apparent. Chaffey College moves this year into a new enlarged campus.

San Diego County: A survey has just been completed involving the Oceanside-Carlsbad and San Dieguito Union High School Districts, along with the Northern San Diego County Junior College District and Julian Union High School District.

Indications are that the most feasible solution consists of a combination of Oceanside-Carlsbad with San Dieguito. The State Board of Education, at its meeting of January 15, authorized an election in this area for the establishment of a junior college district.

In addition to this survey, the County Committee on School District Organization, on request of the Grossmont and Sweetwater Union High School Districts, has undertaken a countywide study of junior college services. This may well result in the establishment of two good-sized junior college districts with the Mountain Empire Unified School District joining with the Grossmont Union High School District and with the Coronado Unified School District joining with the Sweetwater Union High School District.

San Francisco County: The county is contained entirely within the San Francisco Unified School District which operates City College of San Francisco.

San Joaquin County: Junior college services in this county are currently operated by the Stockton Unified School District. There have been some discussions regarding the establishment of a larger junior college district, and an unofficial independent study is being made at one of the universities. No formal actions have been taken of any kind. The College of the Pacific is reported to be negotiating for the purchase of the present Stockton College site, and such a purchase might well trigger consideration for a San Joaquin County district. The county superintendent of schools has proposed resolutions requesting a State Department of Education survey.

San Luis Obispo County: One election recently failed in this county which would have established a countywide district. Restudy of the problem is continuing with the County Committee on School District Organization. By its own volition the San Luis Obispo High School District board of trustees has suspended operations of the unaccredited San Luis Obispo Junior College, which was conducted in the high school building.

San Mateo County: A survey has recently been completed dealing with the possibility of establishing a junior college district in the Sequoia Union High School District area and with the possible annexation of the Sequoia Union High School District to the San Mateo Junior College District. Formal decisions by the governing board are still pending. Planning has proposed a total of four needed campuses in this county--two to be built in the existing San Mateo Junior College District and two outside.

Santa Barbara County: There is no activity in this county. Santa Barbara City College, in the Santa Barbara High School District, serves this area along with Allan Hancock College, maintained by the Santa Maria Joint Junior College District.

Santa Clara County: There is study under way at the present time in Santa Clara County, with considerable discussion involving the governing boards of the high school districts and the County Committee on School District Organization, along with others, regarding the need for additional junior college districts or expansion of existing districts. The new Foothill College and San Jose City College provide existing services. Foothill College has purchased a second campus site.

Santa Cruz County: This county recently established a countywide junior college district which opened Cabrillo College in Watsonville in the fall of 1959.

Shasta County: There is no formal activity in this county. Junior college services are supplied by the Shasta Union High School District at Redding. Some informal discussion has proposed the formation of a larger junior college district. (See Butte County.)

Sierra County: There is no activity in this county, nor any substantial need.

Siskiyou County: There is no activity in this county. The county is entirely included within the Siskiyou Joint Junior College District with the exception of Etna and Tulelake Joint Union High School Districts. The College of the Siskiyous opened its new campus this fall.

Solano County: There is no activity in this county. Junior college facilities are supplied by the Vallejo Unified School District.

Sonoma County: There is no activity in this county either to establish new junior college districts or to expand the existing Santa Rosa Junior College District.

Stanislaus County: One study had been made some years ago of the possibility of expanding the Modesto City Junior College District to include Stanislaus County. At the time the study was made, this did not appear to be feasible. The 1959 changes in the state apportionment formula may have changed this situation as has the substantial increase in the county junior college tax rate. Furthermore, the establishment of Stanislaus County State College as an upper division institution pending the establishment of adequate junior college services in Stanislaus and Merced Counties may well effect change in local junior college district status.

Sutter County: A survey has been made of the possible expansion of the Yuba County Junior College District to include Sutter County. No action has been taken as a result of this survey. The high school district boards of Sutter County have now requested the County Committee on School District Organization to continue this study and possibly recommend a new junior college district including both counties. The East Nicolaus Union High School District board has separately indicated interest in annexing to American River Junior College rather than in joining Yuba College. (See Sacramento County.)

Tehama County: (See Butte.)

Trinity County: No activity in this county, nor need for junior college services.

Tulare County: No activity in this county. Evidence of need for expanding existing districts has as yet resulted in no local action. Porterville College and the College of the Sequoias presently serve the area.

Tuolumne County: (See Amador.)

Ventura County: A survey has been completed for Ventura County indicating either a countywide junior college district or the possible establishment of two districts. No formal action on this recommendation has been taken. The Ventura Union High School District board of trustees, which maintains Ventura College, has withdrawn from the proposed countywide district planning, apparently preferring to continue to serve the county non-district territory and collect the non-district tuition. Oxnard Union High School in the meanwhile is holding discussions with other high school boards of the county to explore the possibility of a second district. About 60 per cent of the Ventura College enrollment comes from outside of its own district.

Yolo County: There is no concerted action in this county except that the Washington Unified and Clarksburg Union High School Districts have been included in the Sacramento County study. Informal talks in the county have suggested a countywide district.

Yuba County: (See Sutter and Butte Counties.)

CHART I

Summary of Activity for Organization of New or Enlargement of Existing Districts Maintaining Junior Colleges in California Counties

Survey, Activity, and Need	No Survey, Activity, and Need	Survey and No Activity, Need	No Survey, No Activity, Need	No Survey, No Activity, and No Need	Adequate for the Present	Well Organized
1. Alameda	1. Nevada	1. Fresno	1. Butte	1. Alpine	1. Lassen	1. Contra Costa
2. Kern	2. San Joaquin	2. Inyo	2. Colusa	2. Amador	2. Marin	2. Imperial*
3. Los Angeles	3. Lake	3. Lake	3. Del Norte	3. Calaveras	3. Napa	3. Placer
4. Monterey	4. Madera	4. Madera	4. El Dorado	4. Mariposa	4. San Benito	4. San Francisco
5. Orange	5. Mendocino	5. Mendocino	5. Glenn	5. Modoc	5. Santa Barbara	5. Santa Cruz
6. Sacramento	6. Merced	6. Merced	6. Humboldt	6. Mono	6. Siskiyou	
7. San Diego			7. Kings	7. Plumas	7. Solano	
8. San Luis Obispo			8. Riverside	8. Sierra		
9. San Mateo			9. San Bernardino	9. Trinity		
10. Santa Clara			10. Shasta	10. Tuolumne		
11. Sutter			11. Sonoma			
12. Ventura			12. Stanislaus			
13. Yolo			13. Tehama			
14. Yuba			14. Tulare			

*Imperial County citizens have recently voted to establish a countywide junior college district.

V. SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED OUTCOMES FROM COUNTIES WHERE SURVEYS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE ORGANIZATION HAVE BEEN MADE, ACTIVITY IS CURRENT, AND NEED IS EVIDENT

In fourteen counties for which surveys have been made recommending junior college districting activity and where local lay and educational interests have followed up on these surveys, the following proposals are to be found:

1. Counties where new districts have been recommended: five (Alameda, Kern, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Clara).
2. Counties where enlarged districts have been recommended: twelve (Alameda, Kern, Los Angeles, Monterey, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Sutter, Ventura, Yolo, and Yuba).

Pressure factors which affect both new district formation and the enlargement of existing districts are these:

1. Lack of adequate present junior college services.
2. A state college is to be established in the area without provision for lower division program until an adequate junior college has been established.
3. Increase in out-of-district county junior college tuition tax rates until they are equal to or exceed the junior college tax rate levied in the adjoining district which maintains a junior college.
4. Changing district patterns (because of unification activity) with need to preserve and/or expand size of existing district which maintains a junior college.
5. The incorporation of two or more existing districts into a larger more effective administrative district.
6. The increase in size of a district maintaining a junior college in order to include the commuting area of its student body to:
 - a. Increase the assessed valuation of a district, and
 - b. Provide broader area membership on the board of trustees, to give better area representation in policy formation.

Because of the fact, as explained earlier, that only local determination can establish a new junior college district, the following prediction of new colleges to be established in the next 15 years is at best an educated guess or at least an estimate of need.

CHART II

New Junior Colleges Projected by 1975 with Projected Full-time Enrollment

County	Maintaining District	1975 Full-time Enrollment
Alameda	Including Hayward, San Leandro, Alameda, Washington Union High School Districts (one or two colleges)	5,000
	Berkeley, Albany, and Emeryville	1,500
Butte	Chico area	575
Contra Costa	Third campus at Antioch	1,500
	Fourth campus at Moraga	750
Humboldt	Eureka area	750
Kern	East Kern and Inyo County area	950
Los Angeles	Burbank	1,250
	Whittier	5,000
	Alhambra, El Monte, Montebello	5,000
	Los Angeles City--new West Los Angeles campus	6,000
	Los Angeles City--new South Central campus	3,500
	Los Angeles City--new N.W. San Fernando campus	3,000
	Los Angeles City--new N.E. San Fernando campus	3,000
	Los Angeles City--new South Coast campus	3,000
	Los Angeles City--new site to be selected	3,000
Mendocino-Lake	County areas	750
Merced-Madera	County areas	1,500
Orange	Anaheim	2,500
Sacramento	Folsom, Cordova area	1,000
San Bernardino	Barstow	400
	Victor Valley	550
	San Bernardino Valley College--second campus	1,000

County	Maintaining District	1975 Full-time Enrollment
San Diego	Grossmont-Mountain Empire	2,250
	Sweetwater-Coronado	2,500
	San Diego City--new campus	3,500
	San Diego City--second new campus	3,000
San Luis Obispo	County unit	1,000
San Mateo	Sequoia and Pescadero	3,000
	College of San Mateo--second campus at San Bruno	2,500
Santa Clara	Campbell, Santa Clara, Los Gatos	2,500
	Foothill College--second campus	2,000
	Eastside, Live Oak, Gilroy	750
Ventura	Oxnard, Moorpark, Simi, Santa Paula, Fillmore	2,500
Total	34 colleges	76,975

This projection of 34 new public junior colleges by 1975, with enrollments totaling 76,975 full-time students, must be viewed with caution because it is at best a prediction. Furthermore, it must be realized that this does not necessarily reflect an increase of this number in the total of young people to be enrolled in junior colleges statewide. Some of these colleges, if organized, will draw off students from existing colleges thereby enabling them to meet local pressures without greater expansion.

The Master Plan Survey recommendation which diverts 50,000 lower division students to the junior colleges is in part responsible for the establishment of some of these colleges. Economy of campus construction for junior colleges as against state college or university construction, as well as the lower instructional costs, will result in a saving to the State of California.

Substantial increase in numbers of districts and in number of attendance centers means on the whole continued increase in enrollments, and it is hoped that not less than the present proportion of high school graduates will have the educational opportunities offered in California public junior colleges.